

## **REMARKS**

The Office Action of August 11, 2005, has been carefully considered. Claims 1-9 have been amended to include limitations directed to determining the location of a Region Of Interest (ROI) based on the bulb of the carotid artery as described in paragraphs 49-54 of the original specification and in the original Claim 19. Claims 10-16 and 20 have been cancelled. New Claims 21-30 have been added and include limitations directed to determining the location of the ROI based on the bifurcation of the carotid artery as described in paragraphs 45-48 of the original specification.

Paragraph 0054 has been amended to recite "preferably an approximately 0.5 centimeters" width and height dimension for the ROI as described in Claim 18 of the original application.

### **Rejections Based on 35 USC § 102**

The examiner has rejected Claims 1-3, 6-13, 16-17 and 20 under 35 USC § 102 as anticipated by Selzer (US 20040116813). Claim 1 has been amended to include a limitation that the Region Of Interest (ROI) is selected by slicing an image into slices, selecting a stripe within each slice which corresponds to the Common Carotid Artery (CCA), computing a size of each selected stripe, comparing the sizes of the selected stripes, selecting the slice including the stripe corresponding to at least a minimum increase in size as the bulb position, and positioning an ROI before the bulb position. Selzer describes an iterative edge detection process, and does not describe slicing a frame into slices, and comparing slices to identify the base of the bulb of the carotid artery. Because Selzer does not describe all the limitation of the amended Claim 1, the Applicant believes that the amended Claim 1 is in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claim 1, and advance Claim 1 toward allowance.

Claims 2, 3, 6-9, and 17 depend from Claim 1. Because the Applicant believes that Claim 1 is now in condition for allowance, the Applicant also believes that Claims 2, 3, 6-9, and 17 are also in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of Claims 2, 3, 6-9, and 17, and advance Claims 2, 3, 6-9, and 17 toward allowance.

Claims 10-13, 16, and 20 have been cancelled.

### **Rejections Based on 35 USC § 103**

The examiner has rejected Claims 4 and 5 under 35 USC § 103 as obvious over Selzer (US 20040116813) in view of Stein (US 6,730,035). Claims 4 and 5 depend from Claim 1. Because the Applicant believes that Claim 1 is now in condition for allowance, the Applicant also believes that Claims 4 and 5 are also in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of Claims 4 and 5, and advance Claims 4 and 5 toward allowance.

The examiner has rejected Claims 1-18 under 35 USC § 103 as obvious over Selzer (US 20040116813) in view of Hossack (US 6,503,202). Claim 1 has been amended to include limitations that the Region Of Interest (ROI) is selected by slicing an image into slices, selecting a stripe within each slice which corresponds to the Common Carotid Artery (CCA), computing a size of each selected stripe, comparing the sizes of the selected stripes, selecting the slice including the stripe corresponding to at least a minimum increase in size as the bulb position, and positioning an ROI with respect to the bulb position. Neither Selzer nor Hossack describe slicing a frame into slices, and comparing slices to identify the base of the bulb of the carotid artery. Because Selzer in view of Hossack does not describe all the limitation of the amended Claim 1, the Applicant believes that the amended Claim 1 is in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of Claim 1, and advance Claim 1 toward allowance.

Claims 2-9, and 17 depend from Claim 1. Because the Applicant believes that Claim 1 is now in condition for allowance, the Applicant also believes that Claims 2-9, and 17 are in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of Claims 2-9, and 17, and advance Claims 2-9, and 17 toward allowance.

Claims 10-16, and 18 have been cancelled.

## CONCLUSIONS

Claims 1-9, 17, and 19 remain pending in the application. New Claims 21-29 have been added. Claims 10-16, 18, and 20 have been canceled. Claim 1 has been amended to overcome the rejections in the Office Action mailed August 11, 2005. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner advance Claims 1-9, 17, 19, and 21-29 to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Kenneth L. Green

Attorney for Applicant

Reg. No. 44,724

Averill & Varn  
8244 Painter Avenue  
Whittier, CA 90602  
(562) 698-8039